1980

Ethnicity on the Great Plains: Preface & Introduction

Frederick C. Luebke
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, fredluebke@comcast.net

Ethnicity on the Great Plains

EDITED BY
Frederick C. Luebke

Published by the
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA PRESS • LINCOLN AND LONDON
for the
CENTER FOR GREAT PLAINS STUDIES
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

[1980]

Preface

The essays presented here were originally prepared for presentation at the second annual symposium sponsored by the Center for Great Plains Studies, which is an interdisciplinary agency of the University of Nebraska–Lincoln for the coordination of research, teaching, and service activities contributing to an understanding of the Great Plains. The symposium attracted the participation of anthropologists, folklorists, geographers, historians, linguists, and sociologists, as well as students of literature and architecture. They came from many parts of the United States, Canada, and Europe, including Germany, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

The response of scholars to the center's call for papers revealed an unexpected richness of research into ethnicity on the Great Plains. Even though the conference was enlarged to accommodate the presentation of thirty-three papers, many worthy proposals could not be accepted. At the same time, there was a dearth of proposals treating certain topics, such as ethnic political behavior, and important ethnic groups, such as the blacks. Inevitably, therefore, this book cannot provide a comprehensive view of its subject. Instead it samples contemporary research and suggests possibilities for further work.

The essays selected for publication in this volume were chosen on the basis of several criteria. I have sought to maintain a balance among the academic disciplines, the ethnic groups treated, and the subregions within the Great Plains. I also tended to select papers that treat numerically larger rather than smaller groups, studies that relate the characteristics of the physical environment to patterns of either persistence or accommodation of ethnic culture, and, finally, essays that analyze intergroup conflicts or make comparisons between two or more ethnic groups. Several papers treating the ethnic literature of the Great Plains will appear in a future volume to be published by the Center for Great Plains Studies.

Many persons, in addition to the authors whose essays are published here, contributed to the making of this book. I am especially indebted to the members of the symposium committee: Stephen Cox, Dale Gibbs, Elaine Jahner, Paul Olson, Paul Schach, Joseph Svoboda, Ralph Vigil, Allen Williams, Susan Welch, Roger Welsch, and David Wishart. They were unfailingly helpful, wise in counsel, and deliberate in judgment. Max Larsen, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Paul Olson, the first director of the Center for Great Plains Studies, and Janet Pieper, administrative assistant, supported the project in every way possible. The Department of History of the University of Nebraska–Lincoln also lent its aid. To all I extend my sincere thanks. Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to the Newberry Library of Chicago for the fellowship that enabled me to use that institution's exceptional resources to complete a major part of my editorial task.

FREDERICK C. LUEBKE

Introduction

Frederick C. Luebke

Immigrants from Europe formed a major element in the population that settled the Great Plains in the nineteenth century; their descendants constitute the majority of persons in many parts of the region today. A century ago, as the agricultural frontier moved across central Nebraska onto what is considered the Great Plains, foreign-born persons consistently formed a much larger proportion of the inhabitants on the western edge of settlement than they did in the state as a whole. Some years later the census of 1890 revealed that in North Dakota, for example, 42.7 percent of the population of that newly admitted state was foreign-born, easily the highest proportion for any state in the Union. According to the census of 1970, immigrants and their children still account for 22.7 percent of North Dakota's population, and in ten of the state's fifty-three counties the proportion exceeds 30 percent.[1]

Although many students of American literature will find such data validated by impressions gathered from the works of Ole Rölvaag, Willa Cather, Mari Sandoz, and other writers, most scholars seem unfamiliar with the importance of ethnicity for the history of the Great Plains. Through the years, state and local historical journals have published many articles, usually written by amateurs, that recount the settlement of various immigrant groups on the plains, but most professionally trained historians have tended to ignore ethnic history and to concentrate on traditional political and economic issues. Some, no doubt, have been influenced by Walter Prescott Webb, who observed in his widely read book, *The Great Plains* (1931), that European immigrants, as well as blacks and Asians, avoided the Great Plains, especially in the southwest, and left the region to old-stock Americans of English and Scottish ancestry. Carl Kraenzel, a sociologist whose *Great Plains in Transition* was published in 1955, described the racial and ethnic minorities of the region in one brief chapter, but concluded that "factors of race,

nationality, and religion" played "only a small part" in accounting for the minority groups of the region. Instead, Kraenzel defined his minorities in economic or occupational terms and emphasized that such groups lacked the techniques needed to control their own economic affairs. Recent journalistic treatments of the Great Plains either ignore ethnicity as a variable in human affairs or treat distinctive groups as curiosities.[2]

The explanation for this failure to incorporate ethnicity into studies of the Great Plains region lies chiefly in the ideas scholars have used to organize their work. Regional studies are naturally conceived in spatial terms; that is, they are founded in the notion that a region has fairly distinct boundaries encompassing uniform physiographic characteristics, such as climate, topography, and soils, that require the inhabitants to act in certain ways or at least within certain limits. Cultural adaptation to the dictates of the physical environment thus becomes tantamount to a successful inhabitation of the region. The scholar may thus be disposed to assume, for example, that all farmers in Rawlins County, which is located in northwestern Kansas and extensively populated by the descendants of German-Hungarian, Swedish, and Czech immigrants, adapted to the environment in much the same way, regardless of ethnocultural origin.[3]

Cultural historians, folklorists, linguists, and other scholars interested in the maintenance of immigrant forms are likely to come to opposite conclusions. They tend to recognize and interpret evidence indicating that newcomers to the plains, either native- or foreign-born, successfully sustained important elements of their culture despite the corrosive effects of the harsh and unyielding environment. Spatial relationships and peculiarities of place are usually not central to their inquiry; instead they attach primary importance to the character and quality of a culture and to the time of its importation into a given area. From this point of view one should expect the patterns of culture on the Great Plains to be mere extensions of what may be found in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa in the north, and Arkansas, Louisiana, and Tennessee in the south. Thus, North Dakota's 42.7 percent foreign-born in 1890 compares to Minnesota's 35.7 percent, just as the 6.8 percent recorded for Texas is similar to Louisiana's 4.4 percent.[4] In the conceptual framework used by the culturalists, the Great Plains naturally lose significance as a region or even as a viable unit for study. The culturalists have tended to slight the unique physiographic and historical characteristics of the Great Plains in much the same way that

environmentalists have tended to ignore the presence of substantial ethnic populations in the region.

Scholars also perceive boundaries in different ways. The environmentalist more than the culturalist is likely to delineate space. This may be seen in exaggerated form in the work of Walter Prescott Webb, who compared the eastern edge of the Great Plains, which he placed in the vicinity of the 98th meridian, to a geological fault line. Few students of ethnicity, however, would see meaningful distinctions based on subtle physiographical differences. The setting of Ole Rölvaag's novel about Norwegian settlers in southeast South Dakota, located east of the 98th meridian, is almost indistinguishable from that described by Willa Cather for the Czechs near Red Cloud, Nebraska, located west of Webb's cultural fault. Popular writers are especially unconcerned by the problem. One merely observes that on the east the Great Plains are bounded by the weather; another expands the region to include Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri.[5]

The northern and southern boundaries of the Great Plains province are also difficult to define. Some scholars include at the southern end little more than the Texas Panhandle; others extend the region south to the Balcones Escarpment, thereby including the Edwards Plateau and the German Hill Country; still others continue to the Gulf of Mexico and add the semiarid, treeless plains that lie between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande. Similarly, in the north the plains do not halt at the Canadian border, but encompass vast stretches of prairie in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. Some scholars end the Canadian plains where the forests begin, but others extend the physiographic province to the Arctic Ocean.[6]

Because this book treats cultural rather than environmental topics, it follows that a broad definition of the Great Plains region should be adopted. The essays included here therefore range from Linda Dégh's study of Hungarians in Saskatchewan to Robert Ostergren's analysis of Swedish settlement in southeastern South Dakota and to Josef Barton's comparison of Czech and Mexican patterns of culture in Nueces County, Texas. In the case of other essays it is most appropriate to speak, not of the Great Plains *region*, but of the Great Plains *states*, chiefly North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, even though significant parts of those states are not included within the limits of the physiographic province.

Given the lack of consensus regarding the extent of the Great

Plains and how the area should be studied, it is understandable that in the past scholars tended to neglect thinking systematically about the concepts and methods of analyzing ethnic minorities in such places as the Great Plains, where cities are few, low population density prevails, and the economy is based on agricultural production. One essay in this volume is addressed specifically to such problems.

Kathleen Conzen, a historian at the University of Chicago, reviews the concepts scholars have used in analyzing immigrant groups in rural environments and outlines a structure for comparative studies based on family and community history. While some scholars have stressed rapid assimilation as the main characteristic of ethnic life in rural environments, Conzen notes, others have emphasized that rural conditions offer favorable opportunities for cultural maintenance. The crucial question, she points out, is whether a given settlement achieved the measure of concentration or density essential for ethnic community formation. For this reason systematic study of rural ethnicity must begin with the compilation of subcounty data on location and residence patterns. It must also account for variations among different ethnic groups in the density required for a community to develop. The role of institutions and agencies in promoting immigrant settlements must be assessed, but attention must focus on the chain migration of families as the main instrument of ethnic clustering. Conzen also stresses the importance of variables such as the availability of land, opportunities for nonagricultural employment, patterns of land acquisition, family size, age, and a wide range of cultural variables, all of which influence the adaptive experience of rural ethnic groups.

Long before the arrival of such white ethnic groups as Conzen has in mind, the Great Plains were inhabited by a variety of aboriginal people who moved in and out of the region over many millennia. They differed from each other in language and custom in much the same ways that Latin, Teutonic, Celtic, and Slavic peoples of Europe were distinguished by widely different linguistic and cultural traits. Much movement among the many tribes of the Great Plains occurred in recent centuries. For example, different Caddoan groups –Arikaras, Pawnees, and Wichitas–migrated to the central plains from the lower Mississippi River region. A Uto-Aztecan tribe, the Comanches, drifted out of the northern intermontane region to the southern plains of Oklahoma and Texas. Various Siouan peoples were forced westward out of the forest lands of the Great Lakes region by the Chippewas. The Sioux, in turn, displaced the Cheyennes, an Algonquian tribe, from the Missouri River valley to the

upper branches of the Platte in Nebraska and Colorado. Such intertribal pressures and migrations continued well into the nineteenth century, when they were further complicated by the forced removal of eastern Indians to present-day Oklahoma and Kansas by the United States government, beginning inthe 1830s. At that time the Great Plains region began to serve as a resettlement zone for eastern tribes, which is the topic treated by Arrell M. Gibson, a historian at the University of Oklahoma.

Gibson places Indian removal, a much discussed topic, into the context of Great Plains settlement and briefly compares the experiences of the Indian exiles to those of later arriving Americans and European immigrants. The eastern tribes, notably the Cherokees, Chickasaws, Choctaws, and Creeks, had moved rapidly toward assimilation with white culture by the 1830s. In an earnest effort to escape displacement, these tribes had adopted an accommodationist strategy of cooperation with the federal government and sought to be acceptable neighbors of the whites by welcoming Christian missionaries, establishing churches, introducing schools, and adopting constitutional government. Such endeavors failed to hinder the policy of relocation undertaken by the Jackson administration. The so-called Five Civilized Tribes, together with various bands of aborigines from the Old Northwest, were forcibly removed to the "permanent Indian reserve" west of Missouri and Arkansas. Thus these involuntary migrants were the first permanent settlers to introduce aspects of Western civilization to the plains region.

The Great Plains as an environment is only peripheral to Gibson's inquiry. To many decision makers in Washington in the 1830s, the Great Plains were the Great American Desert, an inhospitable wasteland, neither suited to nor needed for white habitation. Most eastern Indians also perceived it as an unattractive and undesirable place. Gibson tells us that Indian delegations sent to inspect the colonization area for its suitability as a new home returned with uniformly negative reports. The environment of the plains was radically different from that to which they were accustomed; the scouts predicted ruin for their people if they tried to establish themselves there.

The environment is also incidental to Raymond DeMallie's essay on treaty making between the plains tribes and the United States government. DeMallie, an anthropologist at Indiana University, explores the cultural clash of two idea systems—Indian and white—that symbolize the world, its many parts, and their interrelationships, as observed in the formal proceedings of treaty councils from 1851

to 1892. Both sides attempted to bridge the cultural gap. For Indian leaders, smoking the peace pipe had a significance comparable to that which white men attached to "touching the pen"—signing the treaty document. Each side used strategies to combat the other on its own ground; sometimes the devices used were too subtle for the other side to comprehend. DeMallie analyzes the symbolic significance of rituals practiced by both Indians and whites, the recitals of requests and demands, and the distribution of presents. He demonstrates how each side manipulated kinship metaphors, for example, as tactical devices to gain diplomatic advantage. Throughout his essay, DeMallie seeks especially to understand the full meaning of treaty negotiations from the Indian point of view.

At the same time that the Sioux, Cheyennes, Arapahoes, Kiowas, and other plains tribes were striving to preserve their way of life, an unprecedented wave of immigration from Europe swept across the United States. The great majority of the newcomers emigrated from Germany, the British Isles, the Scandinavian countries, and, beginning in the mid-1870s, Russia. Although most of the immigrants remained in eastern cities, others, especially those who hoped to continue an agricultural livelihood, moved to the frontier of settlement, which was then pushing onto the Great Plains in Kansas, Nebraska, and Dakota Territory.

The settlement of the plains advanced rapidly compared to earlier frontiers. Important technological developments stimulated the process—barbed wire, windmills, the revolver, but above all the railroads. In many parts of the Great Plains, the railroads preceded settlement. Great companies such as the Union Pacific, Northern Pacific, Santa Fe, and Burlington railroads were eager to settle European immigrants on the vast tracts the federal government had granted them as subsidies for railroad construction. Although formal colonization programs were developed for some ethnic groups, especially those with strong religious bonds, most Europeans arrived in family units. Relatives and neighbors often followed soon after until clusters of one ethnic group or another developed here and there.

Table 1 reveals the numerical and proportional distribution of foreign-born inhabitants in the states and territories of the Great Plains region during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The major demographic fact to be derived from these data is that the proportion of ethnic stock decreases substantially as one moves south from the Canadian border. Usually a state has roughly half the proportion of foreign-born persons found in its neighbor to the north.

TABLE 1

Distribution of Foreign-Born Persons in Great Plains States and Territories by Number and Percentage of Total Population, 1860–1900

State or Territory	1860		1870		1880		1890		1900	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
North Dakota	1,774	36.7	4,815	34.0	51,795	38.3	81,461	42.7	113,091	35.4
South Dakota							91,055	26.1	88,508	22.0
Nebraska	6,351	22.0	30,748	25.0	97,414	21.5	202,542	19.1	177,347	16.6
Kansas	12,691	11.8	48,392	13.3	110,086	11.1	147,838	10.4	126,685	8.6
Oklahoma Territory	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,740	3.5	15,680	3.9
Indian Territory	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	.0	4,858	1.2
Texas	43,422	7.2	62,411	7.6	114,616	7.2	152,956	6.8	179,357	5.9
Montana	—	—	7,979	38.7	11,521	29.4	43,096	30.2	67,067	27.6
Wyoming	—	—	3,513	38.5	5,850	28.1	14,913	23.8	17,415	18.8
Colorado	2,666	7.8	6,599	16.6	39,790	20.5	83,990	20.3	91,155	16.9
New Mexico	6,723	7.2	5,620	6.1	8,051	6.7	11,259	7.0	13,625	7.0

Source: "Distribution of Immigrants, 1850–1900," *Reports of the Immigration Commission*, Sen. Doc. no. 756, 61st Cong., 3d sess., 41 vols. (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1911), 3:444–47.

Thus, in 1900, one of three persons in North Dakota was foreign-born, compared to one in six in Nebraska and nearly one in twelve in Kansas.

The data of table 1 should be qualified in several ways. Virtually all of the persons listed for 1860 resided in humid areas east of the Great Plains proper. Most of the foreign-born persons in Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico lived in the mining areas of the mountains. Not until the end of the century did immigrants inhabit the Great Plains parts of these states and territories. Many of the foreign-born persons in North Dakota, Texas, and New Mexico were Canadians or Mexicans rather than Europeans. Since the central and southern plains were settled first, the numbers of immigrants were greatest there, even though the proportions of the foreign-born were highest in the northern plains. By 1890 the concentrations in Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas attained their fullest development. Thereafter, however, numbers and percentages declined as immigration to the United States from northern and western Europe declined, except in North Dakota, where agricultural development continued, especially in the western part of the state.[7]

Each Great Plains state has its own pattern of ethnic group settlement. Table 2 lists numbers and percentages of foreign-stock persons (first- and second-generation) in 1900 for the eastern tier of states. By that time the pattern of ethnic distribution had been firmly established and the flow of emigrants from northern and western Europe had substantially subsided. The census revealed that in North Dakota 30 percent of all persons in the state were born in the Scandinavian countries, with Norway far in the lead. Germans formed the second most numerous group. Virtually all of the numerous Russian-born persons were also German-speaking. This was likewise true of most Austrians, Swiss, and Hungarians in the state. Canadians also constituted a large group in North Dakota, especially in the northern tier of counties and in the broad plain of the Red River, which flows northward into Canada. Although the percentages of foreign-born persons by counties are distributed fairly evenly across the state, Germans from Russia were exceptionally numerous in the south-central part of the state on both sides of the Missouri River. Numbers of Norwegians were especially heavy in the eastern and northern areas.

In South Dakota the Germans plus the Germans from Russia were only slightly more numerous than Scandinavians combined. Norwegians accounted for about two-thirds of the latter and they resided especially in the eastern counties. German-speaking people

TABLE 2

Number and Percentage of Total Population of Foreign-Born White Persons plus Native-Born White Persons of Foreign Parentage in Selected Great Plains States by Country of Origin, 1900

Country of Origin (Total Population)	North Dakota (319,146)	%	South Dakota (401,570)	%	Nebraska (1,066,300)	%	Kansas (1,470,495)	%	Oklahoma Terr. (398,331)	%	Indian Terr. (392,060)	%	Texas (3,048,710)	%
Austria	2,014	.6	1,692	.4	8,085	.8	6,329	.4	1,032	.3	356	.1	15,114	.5
Bohemia	3,654	1.1	6,361	1.6	38,471	3.6	7,788	.5	2,698	.7	50	—	22,713	.7
Canada (English)	31,086	9.7	13,058	3.3	19,304	1.8	18,939	1.3	3,600	.9	819	.2	5,446	.2
Canada (French)	6,512	2.0	3,516	.9	3,003	.3	5,547	.4	702	.2	173	—	1,004	—
Denmark	7,139	2.2	10,450	2.6	26,418	2.5	6,687	.5	582	.1	71	—	2,361	.1
England	7,710	2.4	12,402	3.1	33,586	3.1	45,633	3.1	5,540	1.4	2,586	.7	23,722	.8
France	582	.2	835	.2	2,897	.2	5,813	.4	1,048	.3	568	.1	6,304	.2
Germany	32,393	10.1	55,860	13.9	191,928	18.0	131,563	8.9	18,117	4.5	3,446	.9	157,214	5.2
Hungary	1,797	.6	881	.2	882	.1	935	.1	280	.1	40	—	979	—
Ireland	11,552	3.6	16,017	4.0	45,535	4.3	48,525	3.3	5,534	1.4	2,233	.6	25,373	.8
Italy	731	.2	566	.1	1,278	.1	1,543	.1	74	—	734	.2	7,086	.2
Norway	71,998	22.6	51,191	12.7	7,228	.7	3,726	.3	350	.1	98	—	3,405	.1
Poland	2,112	.7	1,146	.3	7,328	.7	1,478	.1	298	.1	357	.1	8,148	.3
Russia	23,909	7.5	25,689	6.4	14,537	1.4	25,048	1.7	5,536	1.4	398	.1	4,048	.1
Scotland	5,664	1.8	3,943	1.0	9,818	.9	14,186	1.0	1,596	.4	1,008	.3	6,839	.2
Sweden	14,598	4.6	17,163	4.3	54,301	5.1	35,219	2.4	1,290	.3	215	.1	9,297	.3
Switzerland	845	.3	1,638	.4	5,852	.5	9,204	.6	1,108	.3	187	—	3,776	.1
Wales	452	.1	1,889	.5	3,098	.3	5,748	.4	439	.1	392	.1	871	—
Other	2,942	.9	7,065	1.8	5,073	.5	6,050	.5	744	.2	410	.1	146,643	4.8
TOTAL	227,690	71.3	231,362	57.6	478,622	44.9	379,961	25.8	50,568	12.7	14,141	3.6	450,343	14.8

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census Reports*, vol. 1, *Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900*, pt. 1 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1901), pp. cxcvi-cxcvii; for division into first and second generations, see *Reports of the Immigration Commission*, Sen. Doc. no. 756, 61st Cong., 3d sess., 41 vols. (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1911), 3:512-21.

settled most frequently in the east-central and southeastern parts of the state. As in most other states, English-speaking immigrants tended to be evenly distributed. Because of the large Indian reservations in the western half of the state and the wasteland character of much of the terrain, fewer Europeans settled there, with the exception of the Black Hills country. The northwestern corner of South Dakota received large numbers of immigrants later when much agricultural land in that area was homesteaded early in the twentieth century.

In Nebraska the Germans were by far the largest ethnic group. They settled throughout the state but especially in the northeastern quarter. Nebraska's contingent of Germans from Russia (mostly Protestants from the Volga River valley) was smaller than the colonies of Black Sea Germans that predominated in the Dakotas or the Volga German settlements in Kansas. But more Swedes, Danes, and Czechs settled in Nebraska than in any other Great Plains state and strong concentrations of each group developed in the eastern half. Immigrants tended to avoid the sparsely populated Sandhills, a vast area in north-central Nebraska, but farther west, in Nebraska's Panhandle, first- and second-generation immigrants were nearly as numerous proportionately as in the eastern section.

Ethnic-group settlement in Kansas forms a mosaic much like that in Nebraska, though the number of immigrants was only half as large in proportion to the total population. A major concentration of Swedes developed at Lindsborg, Germans west of Marysville, German-Russian Mennonites north of Newton, German-Russian Catholics near Hays, French Canadians at Concordia, and Czechs west of Ellsworth. But in many parts of Kansas, notably in the southern third of the state, comparatively few Europeans settled. Germans were easily the largest single category in Kansas, but English-speaking immigrants collectively were also numerous, English and Irish especially. Welshmen and Scots settled in Kansas more often than in any other plains state.

Few European immigrants chose Oklahoma as their new home in America. This was partly due to its special history as a reserve for Indians relocated there by the government from other parts of the country. Oklahoma did not become a state until 1907, when Indian Territory in the east and Oklahoma Territory in the west were merged to form the state. The heaviest concentrations of foreign stock, which never exceeded 25 percent on a county basis, occurred in the counties north and northwest of Oklahoma City. The Germans were much the largest group, with German Russians

next in size, followed by the English. No other group of immigrants formed more than 1 percent of the total population in 1900. Later, other newcomers from Europe settled in the southeastern, non-Great Plains portion of the state.

Most counties in north and east Texas had even fewer foreign-born inhabitants than Oklahoma. But the proportion rose sharply in the coastal cities of Galveston and Houston and continued in a westward direction to San Antonio and to the German Hill Country west of Austin. This region received large numbers of German immigrants as early as the 1830s. Later smaller numbers of Czechs and Poles entered the area. Farther south, Mexican immigrants formed large proportions of the population of the Rio Grande Valley from El Paso to Brownsville. By 1910 European and Mexican immigrants and their children together constituted more than half the population in south and south-central Texas.

The ethnic populations in the western tier of Great Plains states—Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico—followed eastern settlement patterns, although English-speaking immigrants were proportionately more numerous in the west. In general, the Great Plains counties of these states attracted fewer immigrants than the mountainous areas; the proportion of foreign-born persons was highest in the north and decreased steadily toward the south. Near the border, however, Mexican populations were predominant. In the eastern counties of Montana, especially in the Missouri River valley, immigrants averaged between 15 and 25 percent of the population by 1910. In Wyoming the proportion was typically 10–15 percent in the plains counties. The high plains of Colorado averaged between 5 and 10 percent, with the South Platte Valley in the northeast higher and the southeastern corner lower. In New Mexico, the foreign-born rarely exceeded 5 percent of the population in the eastern counties. In the mountainous southwestern counties, which border on Mexico, the percentage rose to 35 percent by 1910.

In New Mexico, as in Texas and Colorado, the substantial native Hispanic population is naturally not included in the census category of the foreign-born. An ethnic group resulting from the intermarriage of Indians and Spanish since 1600, the Hispanos spread eastward from the Santa Fe area onto the Great Plains. This movement began in the nineteenth century, and today Hispanos form a major element in the several Great Plains counties of northeastern New Mexico and southeastern Colorado. Hispanos are thus to be distinguished from Mexican immigrants. The movement of the latter onto the central and northern plains is a phenomenon of only the past fifty years.

Extensively employed in agricultural field work, railroad maintenance, and meat packing, they now form substantial enclaves in plains cities such as Garden City, Kansas, and Scottsbluff, Nebraska.

Blacks, like the Hispanos, have lived on the Great Plains since the time of the earliest settlements. Their numbers, however, have never constituted a large element in the population except in Oklahoma and Texas, where they have lived in areas not usually considered part of the Great Plains. Following the Civil War blacks were often employed as cowboys or cooks on cattle ranches. Moreover, they formed a major part of the United States Army—the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry and the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Infantry divisions—that was stationed in the Great Plains region during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Later blacks found work as porters on passenger trains and as house servants. The circumstances of their employment generally tended to discourage family life and permanent residence.

Blacks made their first substantial efforts at permanent residence in 1879, when many thousands of former slaves migrated from the South to Kansas. Most settled in cities in the eastern part of the state, but some homesteaded as farmers on the western plains. By 1900 the black population exceeded 50,000 in Kansas and 6,000 in Nebraska. But in the northern plains they constituted less than .1 percent of the population. After Oklahoma was opened to settlement it also attracted many blacks, most of whom lived in a cluster of counties stretching west from Muskogee. By 1900 the number of blacks in Oklahoma increased to 56,000, of whom few resided on the Great Plains proper. Texas, as a slave state before the Civil War, had many blacks in its eastern counties and along the Gulf Coast, but few ever moved into areas considered to be part of the Great Plains. (See table 3.)

The experiences of blacks, Mexicans, Hispanos, and Indians in migration and settlement on the Great Plains were substantially different from those of European immigrant groups because of deeply ingrained habits of racial discrimination in American society. But while the former groups usually moved relatively short distances, the migrations of the latter were often on a world-wide scale and involved careful and deliberate choices. Such movement and its implications for cultural adaptation is illustrated by Timothy Kloberdanz, an anthropologist at North Dakota State University, in his review of German-Russian experiences on three continents.

Kloberdanz's purpose is to study the adaptations made by Volga German settlers in three of the world's major grasslands—the Russian

TABLE 3

Number and Percentage of Total Population in Selected Great Plains States by Racial Groups, 1900

Racial Group (Total Population)	North Dakota (319,146)	%	South Dakota (401,570)	%	Nebraska (1,066,300)	%	Kansas (1,470,495)	%	Oklahoma Terr. (398,331)	%	Indian Terr. (392,060)	%	Texas (3,048,710)	%
White	311,712	97.7	380,714	94.8	1,056,526	99.1	1,416,319	96.3	367,524	92.3	302,680	77.2	2,426,669	79.6
Black	286	.1	465	.1	6,269	.6	52,003	3.6	18,831	4.7	36,853	9.4	620,722	20.4
American Indian	6,968	2.1	20,225	5.0	3,322	.3	2,130	.1	11,945	3.0	52,500	13.4	470	—
Chinese and Japanese	180	—	166	—	183	—	43	—	31	—	27	—	849	—
Mexican[a]	1	—	13	—	27	—	71	—	70	—	64	—	71,062	2.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Abstract of the Twelfth Census of the United States 1900*, 3d ed. (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1904), pp. 40, 61.

[a]Includes first-generation immigrants only; data for Spanish-speaking native-born not available. Mexican immigrants were included in the "white" category.

steppes, the North American Great Plains, and the pampas of Argentina. His focus is on the ways an immigrant people altered its culture in relation to a physical and social environment. He reviews the emigration of Germans to the Volga region in the eighteenth century and the many changes they made in agricultural practice, housing, clothing, diet, and social organization in accommodation to the dry, continental climate and flat terrain. Volga German adaptation to social and political forces, Kloberdanz shows, was much less flexible and led to their reemigration beginning in the 1870s to North and South America, where they deliberately sought physical environments similar to what they had known in Russia. Kloberdanz then summarizes Volga German adaptations in America and, more briefly, in Argentina, and relates them to the culture they had evolved in Russia.

The next essay shifts the analysis of migration and settlement from the continental scale to the microcosmic. Robert C. Ostergren, a geographer at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, analyzes the movement of Swedish immigrants to the Dalesburg settlement in Clay County, South Dakota, in the late 1860s and early 1870s. In its own way, his work is an example of the kind of research called for by Kathleen Conzen earlier in this volume. By systematically organizing and mapping data concerning 206 heads of families, Ostergren reveals in detail the migration experience in relation to settlement patterns. Most of the Dalesburg immigrants came from three distinct districts within Sweden. Sharp variations existed among the three groups with respect to the mode of migration—direct or indirect. Further differences were found in the length of time that elapsed between emigration and settlement in Clay County. Ostergren also relates place of origin in Sweden to the spatial distribution of immigrants within the Dalesburg settlement and suggests, finally, that both impinge on the boundaries of church administrative districts.

A third paper treating migration and settlement is by John A. Hostetler, an anthropologist at Temple University. Hostetler's essay, a study of Old Order Amish colonization efforts on the Great Plains, describes experiences that contrast sharply with those of Kloberdanz's Volga Germans. The latter, with their prior life in a grassland environment, adapted easily and successfully, but the Old Order Amish, a German-culture religious group found chiefly in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, were reluctant to modify their ways and therefore failed. Hostetler's purpose is to identify those aspects of Amish culture that rendered them vulnerable to the adversities

of the Great Plains climate. He finds them in the religiously rooted adherence to intensive farming on a small scale, with horse-drawn implements, in an environment that calls for large-scale, heavily mechanized operations. Unable to adapt without violating their religious raison d'être, most Old Order Amish abandoned their farms and returned to familiar surroundings in eastern states. Of the many Amish settlements attempted on the Great Plains, only three colonies near Hutchinson, Kansas, survived. In these instances, Hostetler reports, prohibitions were relaxed and modern technologies adopted, thereby permitting agriculture on a larger scale, all to the disapproval of eastern church leaders.

Religious belief and custom did not ordinarily inhibit ethnic group settlement, as it did among the Old Order Amish. Instead, church-related institutions usually adjusted to the circumstances of the new environment and often dominated rural and small-town ethnic communities, as Terry Jordan, a geographer at North Texas State University, illustrates in his religious geography of the German Hill Country of Texas. Jordan reviews the history of the several denominations in the area—Lutherans, Evangelicals, Methodists, Catholics, and freethinkers—maps their locations, and reveals varying patterns of residential segregation and spatial organization. He also studies the distinctive architecture of German church buildings erected before 1910, but notes that in burial practice, radical departures from European custom have occurred. Jordan's investigation shows that despite varying degrees of acculturation, much evidence of German ethnicity survives in the Hill Country today.

In the article by Linda Dégh, a folklorist at Indiana University, religion as an aspect of folk culture is shown to have evolved in the plains setting as the central integrative element in a community of Hungarian-Canadians. Dégh, herself an immigrant from Hungary, illustrates the concepts and methods a folklorist may use in the study of religion among immigrants on the local level. She examines spontaneous expressions of ethnicity to reveal the role religion plays in Kipling, Saskatchewan, which is the largest and oldest rural settlement of Magyars in North America. The newcomers, who began to arrive early in the twentieth century, called their settlement Békevár (Bastion of Peace). But religious life was seldom peaceful in this community; strife between two groups of Hungarians of different provincial origins has continued throughout the history of the settlement. The original founders of Békevár were highlanders who through the years formulated an intensely pietistic folk religion that rests on myths about the settlement's founding and fosters the display of

ethnicity. They were joined later by more rapidly assimilating lowlanders who dismiss highlander religiosity as superstition and heresy. Rivalry between the two groups results in much petty jealousy, mistrust, hostility, and the abandonment of joint action. Dégh concludes that in this way religion continues to dominate community life and perpetuates an ethnic identity that would otherwise have disappeared over the years.

The relationships of the Great Plains environment to ethnoreligious experience are remarkably varied. In Hostetler's interpretation of the Old Order Amish, environmental forces are basic. In Jordan's study of the Texas Germans, spatial relationships are important but they are not explicitly connected to the character of the Hill Country environment. For Dégh, the Canadian prairie, an area of low population density, is merely the place where the Hungarian immigrants of her study settled. In the last contribution in this book that treats a religious topic, the physical environment is regarded by its author to have been without significant influence on ethnic-group religious experience in comparison with the impact of men, institutions, and ideas. Bruce Garver, a historian at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, describes the history of Czech freethinkers, the "believing unbelievers" of the Great Plains states.

Garver surveys the ideas, activities, and organizations of Czech freethinkers from the beginning of mass immigration in 1871 to the advent of World War I. The only immigrant group in which the majority had deliberately abandoned all formal ties with organized religion, the Czechs are the most important Slavic people in the Great Plains region. Garver summarizes the numerical strength and distribution of the freethought movement and describes its leaders and publications, and guiding principles. He characterizes freethinker institutions as resolutely secular and dedicated to the maintenance of Czech language and culture. Among them were educational societies to supplement public school instruction, gymnastic organizations, fraternal and benevolent associations, and cemeteries. The most militant of Czech freethinkers organized themselves into Free Congregations. By the time of World War I, Garver reveals, the movement began to decline, a victim of the acculturation process.

The final group of contributions to this volume are conceptualized in ways intended to permit comparisons among different ethnic groups of the Great Plains and with native-born persons. Bradley Baltensperger, a geographer at Michigan Technological University, examines ways in which immigrant farmers in Nebraska adopted American crops and practices. By using census manuscripts

and county assessment records as sources, Baltensperger compares the agricultural behavior of German, German-Russian, and Swedish farmers with that of the American-born from 1880 to 1900 in three counties located near the 98th meridian. In some respects, most notably in corn production, the immigrants rapidly adopted American cropping and livestock practices, but other habits were less subject to modification. He also observes differences among the three immigrant groups. Swedish farmers, for example, tended to conform to the American mode rapidly, while Germans and German Russians retained distinctive cropping systems for a longer time. In some cases crops traditionally preferred by immigrants, such as rye and flax, were dropped shortly after settlement, only to reappear later. By 1900 most of the distinctive aspects of immigrant agriculture in Baltensperger's sample had faded.

The discovery of similarities and contrasts between Czech farmers and Mexican laborers in a modernizing society is the purpose of the essay by Josef J. Barton, a historian at Northwestern University. Barton examines relationships of land and family in Nueces County, Texas, early in the twentieth century. He finds that both groups were highly transient, but each was united by bonds of common origin and kinship. Whereas Czechs were linked by generational lines, Mexicans were united by lateral ties among kinfolk. Among the Czechs landownership quickly became the mode, but Mexican tenant farmers were reduced to a migrant, landless rural proletariat. Both groups, however, attempted to use familiar forms as they faced new and altered circumstances in Nueces County. Out of such confrontations, Barton observes, emerged ethnic cultures that shaped and sustained their lives. Religion became the bond of community in both groups, as cooperative efforts were transformed into institutions and ritual associations into resources for collective action.

The final contribution to this anthology is an analysis of ethnic assimilation in contemporary Nebraska by J. Allen Williams, David R. Johnson, and Miguel A. Carranza, sociologists at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. The study offers measurements of cultural, social, and psychological assimilation among seventeen different ethnic groups by analyzing the responses of 1,867 randomly selected adult Nebraskans. The results of the survey are compared with similar findings for a national sample and show that the ability of Nebraskans to identify their ethnic origin is above the average for the United States. Nebraskans also tend to attach more importance to ethnic origin than do persons in the nation-wide sample. Generally, the findings of the study indicate that the earlier an ethnic group

settled in Nebraska, the higher its socioeconomic status is, and the lower the social distance is between the ethnic group and society at large, then the greater its assimilation will be. Although assimilation in Nebraska has been extensive, it is far from complete.

Although Williams, Johnson, and Carranza do not directly treat the Great Plains environment as impinging on assimilation, they consider the matter implicitly in their ecological variables of the degree of dispersion of ethnic-group population across the state and the degree of population density. Their data support the hypothesis that a high dispersion rate and a low density are positively associated with rapid assimilation; their findings conform to Kathleen Conzen's observation that a given ethnic group seems to require a certain degree of concentration or density for community formation to occur. Thus, in places where low population density generally prevails, the great distances between neighbors tend to limit the ability of immigrants and their children to support the organizations and institutions necessary for an ethnic community to emerge, unless they constitute an unusually large proportion of the population in a limited area.

Collectively the essays of this volume show that the Great Plains region has been marked strongly by the various ethnic groups that settled there. Among the earliest to arrive were eastern Indians who had been removed to the plains by the United States government. Confrontation between Indians and whites has been a major theme in the history of the area. The immigration of Europeans, chiefly Germans, Scandinavians, and English-speaking persons from the British Isles and Canada, as well as Czechs, has been of transcendant importance for Great Plains states, particularly in the North. They arrived in America as the wave of agricultural settlement swept across the Great Plains in the last decades of the nineteenth century. A large proportion of these newcomers sought to establish themselves as farmers and they arrived at a time when technological advances in transportation, communication, and farm machinery enabled them to persist in an environment that often seemed threatening and unattractive. In more recent times, immigrants from Mexico, together with native Hispanos, have imprinted portions of the southern plains with their form of Latin culture.

Assimilation has not been uniform among the several groups studied here, and it has been more rapid in some areas of life than in others. Except for exclusive ethnoreligious groups, ethnic differentiation in economic activities, such as agricultural practice, has been less apparent than in cultural and religious affairs. Ethnicity as

manifested through religious culture is shown to have been a strong integrating force for certain groups of Mexicans, Czechs, Germans, Swedes, and Hungarians, but it is not clear that this was the case for those groups generally.

Evidence concerning the effect of the Great Plains environment on ethnicity is inconsistent and seems to be related to the nature of the question asked. The spatial distribution or concentration of specific groups in a given area has been influenced by environmental factors, but social and cultural variables—especially kinship and religion—seem generally to have been more important. Moreover, essayists who consider the semiarid, treeless environment with its low population density to have been significant generally interpret its effect as having accelerated the process of assimilation. Paradoxically, however, ethnic identification continues in the Great Plains at a rate apparently higher than in the United States as a whole. This is partly due, one suspects, to the recency of settlement in the region in comparison with other parts of the nation. In this sense the Great Plains area is still a new country, as the world measures time. Even though ethnic institutions are rapidly fading and immigrant languages rarely function as they once did, group memories remain strong, especially among persons who retain traditional attachments to the now thoroughly Americanized immigrant churches, such as the Catholic, Lutheran, and Mennonite.

The census of 1970 suggests the present-day number and distribution of racial and ethnic groups in the Great Plains states (see table 4). American Indians continue to be important minorities in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Oklahoma. Blacks are especially numerous in Texas and Oklahoma, but relatively few of them reside in the Great Plains portions of those states. Chicanos are exceptionally strong in south Texas. They constitute a majority of the population in the area between the Nueces and the Rio Grande.[8]

In most parts of the Great Plains, however, the pattern of ethnic-group distribution established during the settlement period of the nineteenth century remains today, even though the second generation of European immigrant groups outnumbers the first by a ratio of ten to one. Taken together, the two generations still constitute more than a fifth of the total population of North Dakota; the proportion in other states decreases steadily to about 3 percent as one moves south to Texas. The continuing importance of European ethnicity on the northern plains is suggested by the fact that in 1970 nearly a sixth of the population of North Dakota still identified German as their mother tongue. At the same time, another sixth

TABLE 4

Racial Groups, Selected Mother-Tongue Groups, and Foreign-Born Persons plus Native-Born Persons of Foreign Parentage by Country of Origin in Great Plains States, by Number and Percentage of Total Population, 1970

Race, Country of Origin, of Mother Tongue (Total Population)	North Dakota (617,761)	%	South Dakota (665,507)	%	Nebraska (1,483,493)	%	Kansas (2,246,578)	%	Oklahoma (2,559,229)	%	Texas (11,196,730)	%
American Indian	14,369	2.3	32,365	4.9	6,624	.4	8,672	.4	98,468	3.9	17,957	.2
Black	2,494	.4	1,629	.2	39,911	2.7	106,977	4.8	171,892	6.7	1,399,005	12.5
Spanish mother tongue (foreign- and native-born)	1,139	.2	1,488	.2	13,289	.9	31,577	1.4	21,843	.9	1,793,462	16.0
Mexico	*276*	—	*472*	*.1*	*5,552*	*.4*	*13,728*	*.6*	*6,071*	*.2*	*711,058*	*6.4*
Other races (mostly Chinese and Japanese)	1,413	.2	1,182	.2	4,091	.3	8,861	.4	8,507	.3	62,640	.6
Subtotal (omit Mexico)	19,415	3.1	36,664	5.5	63,915	4.3	156,087	6.9	300,710	11.8	2,190,660	19.6
Canada	15,630	2.5	6,617	1.0	8,247	.6	10,425	.5	7,811	.3	35,900	.3
United Kingdom	3,537	.6	4,562	.7	11,083	.7	15,986	.7	9,812	.4	49,185	.4
Eire	1,248	.2	1,980	.3	4,846	.3	4,853	.3	2,386	.1	12,143	.1
Norway	38,722	6.3	18,898	2.8	3,183	.2	1,920	.1	901	—	5,442	—
Sweden	8,434	1.7	7,790	1.2	17,099	1.2	9,622	.4	1,962	.1	10,873	.1
Denmark	3,443	.6	6,584	1.0	13,202	.9	3,200	.1	1,396	.1	4,801	—
Netherlands	1,120	.2	5,126	.8	1,754	.1	1,692	.1	1,101	—	4,722	—
Germany	21,004	3.4	26,792	4.0	62,726	4.2	43,252	1.9	21,475	.8	104,726	.9
German mother tongue (foreign- and native-born)	*94,036*	*15.2*	*68,900*	*10.4*	*107,608*	*7.3*	*106,040*	*4.7*	*37,428*	*1.5*	*237,572*	*2.1*

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Race, Country of Origin, of Mother Tongue (Total Population)	North Dakota (617,761)	%	South Dakota (665,507)	%	Nebraska (1,483,493)	%	Kansas (2,246,578)	%	Oklahoma (2,559,229)	%	Texas (11,196,730)	%
Poland	1,952	.3	1,047	.2	8,333	.6	4,046	.2	2,670	.1	15,328	.1
Czechoslovakia	2,473	.4	3,507	.5	19,551	1.3	4,978	.2	3,411	.1	29,536	.3
Austria	2,254	.4	1,305	.2	3,612	.2	5,581	.2	1,893	.1	13,397	.1
USSR	33,177	5.4	14,041	2.1	14,160	1.0	17,664	.8	5,463	.2	16,149	.1
Italy	485	.1	616	.1	6,414	.4	4,552	.2	3,431	.1	26,886	.2
Other Europe	6,973	1.1	5,215	.8	12,119	.8	16,066	.7	7,882	.3	45,100	.4
Subtotal, Europe and Canada (omits German mother tongue)	140,452	22.7	104,080	15.6	186,329	12.6	143,837	6.4	71,594	2.8	374,188	3.3
All other	3,533	.6	3,020	.5	8,623	.6	9,458	.4	5,623	.2	75,094	.7
Grand total (omits Mexico and German mother tongue)	163,400	26.5	143,764	21.6	258,867	17.4	309,382	13.8	377,927	14.8	2,639,942	23.6

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population, 1970*, vol. 1, *Characteristics of the Population*, pt. 1, *United States Summary*, sec. 1 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1973), pp. 293, 472-80.

claimed some other language—chiefly Norwegian or Swedish—as their mother tongue. South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas display similar though lower proportions. Obviously, the mother-tongue groups in these states include many more persons than those included in the first- and second-generation immigrant categories. Since the ranks of the Germans, Scandinavians, German Russians, and others who settled the plains have not been replenished by many new immigrants in recent decades, this remarkable retention of ethnic language will soon fade. But other characteristics rooted in ethnicity—values, attitudes, behaviors of various kinds—are likely to continue for many years and to influence the social and political affairs of the region in subtle ways, as they have in the past.

Notes

1. I have attempted to give a systematic introduction to this topic in "Ethnic Group Settlement on the Great Plains," *Western Historical Quarterly* 8 (October 1977): 405–30. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population, 1970*, vol. 1, *Characteristics of the Population*, pt. 1, *United States Summary*, sec. 1 (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1973), p. 472. In addition to the published data in the decennial census reports, see *Reports of the Immigration Commission*, Senate Doc. no. 756, 61st Cong. 3d sess., 41 vols. (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1911), 3:444–47.

2. Walter Prescott Webb, *The Great Plains* (Boston: Ginn, 1931), p. 509; Carl F. Kraenzel, *The Great Plains in Transition* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1955), pp. 235, 238–49; Neal R. Peirce, *The Great Plains States of America* (New York: Norton, 1973); and Russell McKee, *The Last West: A History of the Great Plains of North America* (New York: Crowell, 1974). The most recent treatment of the region, Alexander B. Adams, *Sunlight and Storm: The Great American Plains* (New York: Putnam, 1977) omits all ethnic groups save the Indians and only summarizes briefly the period since 1870.

3. J. Neale Carman, *Foreign-Language Units of Kansas*, vol. 1, *Historical Atlas and Statistics* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1962), pp. 240 f. Cf. Terry G. Jordan, *German Seed in Texas Soil: Immigrant Farmers in Nineteenth-Century Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966), and Russell W. Lynch, *Czech Farmers in Oklahoma*, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College Bulletin no. 39 (Stillwater, 1942).

4. *Reports of the Immigration Commission*, 3:444–47.

5. O.E. Rölvaag, *Giants in the Earth* (New York: Harper, 1927); Willa Cather, *My Ántonia* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1918); McKee, *Last West*; Peirce, *Great Plains States*.

6. See A.K. Lobeck, *Physiographic Diagram of the United States* (New York: Geographical Press, Columbia University, 1922 and later editions); Nevin M. Fenneman, *Physiography of the Western United States* (New York: McGraw-

Hill, 1931); Webb, *Great Plains*, p. 8 and passim; Great Plains Committee, *The Future of the Great Plains* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1936), p. 24; E. Cotton Mather, "The American Great Plains," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 62 (June 1972): 237-39; and Elwyn B. Robinson, "An Interpretation of the History of the Great Plains," *North Dakota History* 41 (Spring 1974): 5-18. See also the discussion by Richard A. Bartlett in *The Great Plains Experience: Readings in the History of a Region*, ed. James E. Wright and Sarah Rosenberg (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Mid-America, 1978), pp. 15-22.

7. Maps showing the spatial distribution of racial and ethnic groups in the United States vary greatly in quality. Among the best for historical purposes are those found in the decennial census reports; they formerly included extensive and detailed maps showing in color the distribution, density, and concentration of the various racial and ethnic groups. For example, see U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Atlas, Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1903), plates 55-75. Richard Hartshorne, "Racial Maps of the United States," *Geographical Review* 28 (April 1938): 276-88 is a useful introduction. On the state level there is nothing comparable to Carman's extraordinary work, *Foreign-Language Units of Kansas*, vol. 1, *Historical Atlas and Statistics*, but see Terry G. Jordan, "*Annals* Map Supplement Number Thirteen: Population Origin Groups in Rural Texas," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 60 (June 1970): 404-5. For individual racial groups, the Bureau of the Census has produced useful maps for Negroes and American Indians with data mapped on the county level. For European ethnic groups, only the Germans have been adequately treated. See Heinz Kloss, *Atlas of Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century German American Settlements* (Marburg, West Germany: N. G. Elwert, 1974). For a review of other efforts, see Karl B. Raitz, "Ethnic Maps of North America," *Geographical Review* 68 (July 1978): 335-50.

8. See Donald W. Meinig, *Imperial Texas: An Interpretive Essay in Cultural Geography* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969), pp. 87, 90-101.